

the other side of the aisle to stop taxing older Americans and start giving them the relief they richly deserve.

THE RUPERT MURDOCH TAX BREAK

(Mr. DEUTSCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, there is an expression that most of us have heard: "If it walks like a duck and it sounds like a duck and it quacks like a duck and it smells like a duck, then it is probably a duck." But we might want to change that in this Chamber to say that "Maybe it is NEWT GINGRICH."

My, my—a special tax break for Rupert Murdoch, \$63 million, and then blaming it on Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN. All of us might think so, but no one in America believes it.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. GINGRICH, no one in America believes that it was Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN. You know it was you. You know what was involved. It would not have happened without you, and it is wrong. It is business as usual in this Chamber, and it is wrong.

I urge the President to veto this legislation. He needs to veto it. It is not what the American people want. It is the absolute wrong way we ought to be conducting ourselves in this Chamber.

CUTTING TAXES FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind the previous speaker that it was Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN who was primarily responsible for that whole matter.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the Democratic majority in the House muscled through the largest tax increase in U.S. history without one Republican vote.

Buried deep in tax language, the Democrats even included a cut in Social Security benefits for senior citizens. That's right, every senior citizen making \$34,000 is rich according to the Democrats definition and guess what? They all got a cut in 1993.

I am proud to say that tomorrow we will restore Social Security benefits to their prior level and lessen the squeeze on the middle class.

Instead of finding clever ways to take more money from our senior citizens and middle-class Americans—we are restoring benefits, lowering taxes, encouraging investment and savings, and letting Americans keep more of their hard-earned money.

I have a question for my Democratic colleagues. Can you justify the current tax burden on our senior citizens? Can you justify the tax burden on working families? If the answer is no, then support our tax reduction package.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The Chair wishes to remind the Members that reference to Members of the other body is not encouraged and is not tolerated in the House.

CUTS IN PROGRAMS PAVE THE WAY FOR TAX BREAK FOR RUPERT MURDOCH

(Mr. KLINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I have learned over the years as a journalist hat where there is smoke there is fire, and I have learned as a Congressman that sometimes when there is a fire, it can quickly become an inferno.

We began talking at the beginning of this new Congress about the fact that there was something smelly about a \$4.5 million book deal for Speaker NEWT GINGRICH being offered by Rupert Murdoch. Now we find out that it was indeed that same Rupert Murdoch who gets \$63 million in special tax advantages hidden away in a bill that came through conference and was brought out on this floor last week.

I ask the Members, let us take a look at what we are doing. We are being asked to cut Stafford loans which would cause 4.5 million students' tuition to go up 20 to 30 percent, but we would give \$63 million in tax breaks to Rupert Murdoch. We are being asked to cut work-study programs that pay 75 percent of the wages for students, 700,000 students, who are willing to work their way through school, but we have \$63 million to give away to Mr. Murdoch.

Mr. Speaker, as we are taking money from women, infants and children, we seem to have money for Rupert Murdoch, a friend of the Speaker.

REPEAL OF CLINTON PENALTY TAX ON SENIOR CITIZENS IS PART OF TAX RELIEF BILL

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 1993, President Clinton and the liberal Democrats passed the largest tax increase in American history—\$240 billion.

The 1993 tax bill included a provision that increased—from 50 to 85 percent—the tax on Social Security benefits received by senior citizens. Why the President chose to increase taxes on people who have worked hard and paid taxes all their lives is beyond belief. Ironically, this is the same President who used Social Security as his excuse to oppose the balanced budget amendment.

Liberal Democrats chose to raise taxes on our senior citizens instead of cutting their own spending. Republicans plan to repeal this onerous tax

on seniors and at the same time balance the budget.

We do not have to tax seniors to reduce the deficit—we can and will cut our own spending. We must repeal the Clinton penalty tax on senior citizens. If you support seniors, then support the Republican tax relief bill.

TAX CUT PROPOSAL IS IRRESPONSIBLE

(Mr. PAYNE of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, Republican Members of this House joined me and almost 70 other Democrats in supporting the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

We came together out of a shared belief that we can't continue to saddle the American people with a national debt that saps our productive capacity, hinders job growth, and causes so much of our wealth to be used just to service the national debt.

We heard a lot during that debate about our responsibility to future generations, about the need for fiscal discipline, an about the need to make tough choices.

Well, what happened?

Here we are in April, and the leadership's idea of fiscal discipline is a 5-year, \$188 billion tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, this tax cut is not the kind of tough choice that this deficit cries out for. It is not disciplined.

And it is plain bad economics.

Make no mistake: with this poorly times tax cut, the House is ready to repeat age-old Washington mistake of borrowing from our children to pay for what is popular right now.

I urge my colleagues to reject this costly and fiscally irresponsible proposal.

AN ODE ON TAX RELIEF

(Mrs. MYRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, as we debate tax relief this week—I would like Members to consider the message of this poem—sent to me by a constituent:

Tax his cow, tax his goat
Tax his pants, tax his coat,
Tax his crops, tax his work,
Tax his tie, tax his shirt,
Tax his chew, tax his smoke;
Teach him taxes are no joke.
Tax his oil, tax his gas,
Tax his notes, tax his cash;
Tax him good and let him know—
After taxes he has no dough.
If he hollers, tax him more
Tax him 'til he's good and sore.
Tax his coffin, tax his grave,
Tax the sod in which he lays.
Put these words upon his tomb;
"Taxes drove me to my doom."
And after he's gone he can't relax;
They'll still be after inheritance tax!